

No doubt it is assumed that the degree of sacrifice will be graded; and the idea that one family should resign £1 of its weekly income and another only 1s. may appear equitable to the economist. But the physiologist must ask what this 1s. represents in terms of a sufficiency of food and warmth. Already the increase in prices has compelled many families to adjust their food habits. Rationing has not been, nor would it be expected to be, effective in preventing this. When a large working-class population is affected by an increase in prices and a shortage of certain foods, the protective foods tend to be replaced by cheaper foods deficient in health factors. The disturbance of a country's economic habits by decree may have serious consequences, but the disturbance of people's food habits may be even more serious. An uncontrollable change in diet necessitated by a fall in purchasing power may lead to severe malnutrition.

It is not enough to say that the worst cases of destitution will be relieved. We are dealing with a complex series of changes. We might cope with rationing alone, with a rise in prices alone, or with a fall in income in many working-class homes alone, but when all three happen together and at varying accelerations, it is difficult to estimate the result in terms of working-class diets. We may be only at the initial stages of profound changes in purchasing power and food prices. It is of the utmost importance that measures should be taken now to ensure that the ratio of purchasing power to retail food prices be adjusted so that there need be no deterioration in the diet of the wage-earner.

F. GOWLAND HOPKINS,  
For the Children's Nutrition Council.

## Is War Dysgenic?

*To the Editor, Eugenics Review*

SIR,—In the report of the Members' Luncheon in the last issue of the *EUGENICS REVIEW*, Lord Horder is represented as saying that "war is dysgenic."

So definite a statement from so eminent an authority naturally carries the very greatest weight, and although I can scarce muster courage enough to voice the question, I am left with a feeling that we have not heard the whole story.

That war carries off the physical flower of a nation is obvious, and thus—within the nation—war must be dysgenic. But what of the bigger aspect? What if the question is viewed not as a national issue, but as a world-wide issue? It seems to me that between nation and nation war is not at all dysgenic, and is in fact Nature's usual way of solving the problem of which body of organisms is better fitted to survive within a certain set of circumstances. For surely Natural

Selection is eugenic? And although it may be objected that modern weapons enable the less fit to destroy the more fit, the fact remains that the nation equipped with better brains that are able to construct and handle the modern weapons will be the Nation to survive. And any war, ancient or modern, always calls for perfect physical fitness. So that if war ensures that the nation possessing the best brains and the best bodies must survive, how can it be described so definitely as dysgenic?

I do not make this as a statement, but in all humility I ask the question.

C. USHER,  
Squadron Leader.

## Eugenics and the Rights of Man

*To the Editor, Eugenics Review*

SIR,—As members of the *Eugenics Society* are no doubt aware, there have been attempts of late to draw up a new statement of the Rights of Man. These may be embodied in the Constitution of a European Federation which may be organized after the war, in which case it is very important that the eugenic viewpoint should not be overlooked. There is, for instance, the proposed clause to the effect that no bodily mutilation of whatever sort shall be inflicted on any man without his consent, and this may serve as a legal impediment to sterilization of the grossly unfit for the protection of posterity. It is true that the Society at present only urges voluntary sterilization, but the time may later be deemed ripe for something more effective in the case of those who persist in perpetuating gross defects. We may at some future date recognize that man has the right to do all that may become a man, but not to damage the unborn in the name of his own personal freedom.

Again, the right of migration has been demanded. We may believe in the right of movement which at present is largely denied us; but there are very important eugenic aspects of the migration problem which must not be lost sight of, and ought to be thoroughly studied in the interests of humanity. The indiscriminate crossing of primary races, such as White and Black, is found to produce only too frequently types of humanity with unbalanced minds, ungainly bodies and great lack of moral stamina. Migration of a sort likely to mix African or Asiatic blood, therefore, with European, should not be encouraged.

There are other aspects, too, of the question of man's natural rights and of the problem of Federal Union likely to result from the present war, that merit careful study on the part of eugenicists. Is the *Society* taking any steps in this respect?

C. WICKSTEED ARMSTRONG.

Braamcamp, 10.  
Lisbon.